

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed September 26, 2007, claims 1 – 6 were rejected. In response, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 3, canceled claims 5 and 6, and added new claims 7 – 10. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amended claims, the added claims, and the below-provided remarks.

Objections to the Specification

The Office Action suggests that section headings be added to the specification according to the guidelines set forth in 37 CFR 1.77(b). Applicant notes that the suggested section headings are not required and, hence, Applicant respectfully declines to amend the specification to include the indicated section headings.

Response to Claim Rejections

Claims 1 – 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the acknowledged prior art and in view of Rao et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,770,886, hereinafter Rao). However, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable over the acknowledged prior art in view of Rao the reasons provided below.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to particularly point out that the Schottky diode “simultaneously forms” the rectifier diode and the second protection diode. Support for this amendment is found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, paragraphs [0009] and [0028] (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2005/0231863 A1).

Applicant asserts that the acknowledged prior art in view of Rao does not teach or suggest a Schottky diode that “simultaneously forms” the rectifier diode and the second protection diode as recited in amended claim 1. In particular, while Rao may teach using a Schottky diode for ESD protection, neither the acknowledged prior art nor Rao teach or suggest using a Schottky diode to simultaneously form a rectifier diode and a second protection diode. As stated in Applicant’s specification at paragraph [0009], using a Schottky diode to simultaneously form the rectifier diode and the second protection diode enables one diode with a p/n junction to be omitted from the integrated circuit, thereby

reducing markedly the input capacitance between the two terminals of the integrated circuit and achieving a space saving when the ESD protection circuit is implemented in integrated technology.

Independent Claim 3

Independent claim 3 has been amended to include a similar limitation to claim 1 and to remove the phrase “the following means.” In view of the similarities between claim 3 and claim 1, Applicant asserts that the remarks provided above in regard to claim 1 apply also to claim 3. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claim 3 is not rendered obvious from the prior art references.

Dependent Claims 2 and 4

Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 and claim 4 is dependent on claim 3. Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 2 and 4 are allowable at least based on allowable base claims.

New Claims 7 – 10

New claims 7 – 10 recite that the rectifier includes additional Schottky diodes. Support for new claims 7 – 10 is found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, paragraph [0026] and Fig. 2, elements 22, 23, and 24 (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2005/0231863 A1). Applicant asserts that the acknowledged prior art in view of Rao does not teach or suggest a rectifier that includes additional Schottky diodes as recited in claims 7 – 10.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments, the new claims, and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Date: December 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111